

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4-10, and 12-21 are currently pending in the present application, with Claims 19-21 being added. Reconsideration and reexamination of the claims are respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected Claims 1, 4, 8, 9, 12 and 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable in view of Yager et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,983,236) and Nagai et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,795,092).

As previously communicated, the present invention is directed to a multimedia execution system and a multimedia file structure for used in such a system. In particular, the present invention is directed to a multimedia system having a file storage that stores multimedia file constituting multiple sequence tracks, wherein the sequence track share the same data structure constituted by a sequence of events and corresponding durations that indicate time intervals between each successive event (see Fig. 3 of the present application illustrating alternating arrangement of event and duration information; see also pages 10-13 of the present application). One important advantage of the present invention, as claimed, is the ability to determine the start time of an event or a series of events by accumulating the duration time information (see page 13, lines 7-12 of the present application).

As acknowledged by the Examiner on page 4 of the office action, Yager does not contain any disclosure or suggestion of a multimedia file comprising a plurality of sequence tracks, each of which constitutes sequence events as well as durations that indicate the time intervals between the successive events.

Nagai fails to make up for the deficiencies of Yager in that Nagai does not contain any disclosure or suggestion of multimedia files comprising sequence tracks having sequence events and durations of time between the events. Rather, as shown in Fig. 5 of Nagai, Nagai teaches organizing

scenes of a data structure on a time axis. Specifically, in Fig. 5, the ordinate represents the type of each media data set, while the abscissa represents time. The bolded bar lines in the graph represents the reproduction time for each of the media data set. There is simply no provision of duration information indicating time intervals between the successive events of a given sequence track. Rather, Nagai simply teaches dividing an original media file into scenes, as shown in Fig. 6. For instance, time 0-7 of shown on the time axis in Fig. 5 is divided into scene times 0-2, 2-4, 4-6, and 6-7 as shown in Fig. 6. The division of the media file into scenes is an allocation step unrelated to the contents of any sequence tracks; Nagai simply does not teach or suggest incorporating duration information within a sequence track to indicate the time intervals between the successive events. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1, 4, 8, 9, 12 and 16-18 are not obvious in view of Yager and Nagai.

The Examiner rejected Claims 2 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yager, Nagai, and Chernock et al. (U.S. patent no. 6,314,569). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, neither Yager nor Nagai teach or suggest a multimedia file comprising a plurality of sequence tracks, each of which constitutes sequence events as well as durations that indicate the time intervals between the successive events. Chernock fails to make up for this deficiency. Chernock is directed to an A/V system for displaying multimedia files including personalized supplementary audio/video information. Chernock does not teach or suggest incorporating duration information within a sequence track to indicate the time intervals between the successive events. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2 and 10 are not obvious in view of the combination of Yager, Nagai, and Chernock.

The Examiner rejected Claims 5-7 and 13-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yager, Nagai, and Coelho et al. (U.S. patent no. 5,748,196). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Again, as discussed above neither Yager nor Nagai teach or suggest a multimedia file comprising a plurality of sequence tracks, each of which constitutes sequence events as well as durations that indicate the time intervals between the successive events. Coelho also fails to make up for this deficiency. Coelho is directed to a method of associating possible data processing paths with A/V signals. Coelho does not remotely teach or suggest incorporating duration information within a sequence track to indicate the time intervals between the successive events. Accordingly, Applicants further respectfully submit that Claims 5-7 and 13-15 are not obvious in view of the combination of Yager, Nagai, and Coelho.

New Claims 19-21 have been added to claim additional aspects of the present invention, and are respectfully submitted as in condition for allowance for the same reasons stated above.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If the Examiner believes it would further advance the prosecution of the present application, he is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney with any issues or questions.

In the unlikely event that the transmittal letter is separated from this document and the Patent Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, Applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Assistant Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No. 03-1952** referencing docket no. 393032025600.

Dated: November 2, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

David T. Yang

Registration No.: 44,415

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP

555 W. Fifth Street, Suite 3500

Los Angeles, CA 90013

(213) 892-5587

Attorneys for the Applicant